

REMARKS

Claims 14-26 are pending. Claims 1-10 and 16 are currently canceled. Claims 14, 20-22, and 24-25 are currently amended. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

A dated copy of “Electrically Conductive Adhesives” that is Chapter 35 in the *Handbook of Adhesive Technology, First Edition*, is included. Please initial the IDS of February 21, 2006 and consider the reference in further prosecution.

Objection of Abstract

Applicant notes Examiner’s objection to the Abstract presented in the Office Action of June 02, 2008. Applicant has checked the specification as filed on PAIR and finds that the Abstract is on a separate page, page 19 in the specification as filed. Therefore, Applicant traverses the objection on the grounds that the current Abstract is not on a separate sheet and does meet the requirements of MPEP 608.01(b).

§ 112 Rejections

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards (or Applicants regard) as the invention. It is the Examiner’s position that the phrase, “an effective amount of one or more crosslinking agents” is indefinite and that it is unclear what makes the crosslinking agent effective and how it effects the novolac phenolic resins. The Examiner also asserts that it is unclear how much crosslinking agent is needed, in order to be effective.

The Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the following reason. Applicants point to the specification as filed on page 7, lines 5-19. The cured adhesive of amended claim 14 has a glass transition temperature of less than about 60°C. The uncured (uncrosslinked) novolac phenol resin or resins of the heat-activatable adhesive are not crosslinked or crosslinked to a low degree only so that they are still thermoformable (see page 5, lines 8-12 of the specification). One of ordinary skill in the art would know that an effective amount of crosslinker would be

enough crosslinker to make the resin thermosettable (not thermoformable) and reduce the glass transition temperature to less than about 60°C. Since some commercially available novolac phenolic resins often include HMTA and/or another crosslinking agent which has to be taken into account when adjusting the level of crosslinking agent (see page 5, lines 4-7), an effective amount of crosslinker, according to amended claim 14, would take the already present crosslinking agents into account. Thus, the Applicants recite “an effective amount” of one or more crosslinking agents.

The Applicant has amended claims 20- 22, and 24- 25 to remove the term “optionally”. These amendments will overcome the Examiner’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In summary, Applicant submits (or Applicants submit) that the rejections of claims 14, 20-22, and 24-25 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, have been overcome, and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 14-19 and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by Ozawa et al. (U.S. 5,385,979). It is the Examiner’s position that Ozawa discloses an adhesive composition comprising a heat-reactive phenolic resin, prepared as a novolac phenolic resin, and an elastomer, such as natural rubber, synthetic rubber or acrylonitriles-butadiene copolymer (column 5, lines 54-65 and column 7, lines 25-33), as in claims 16-17. The Examiner goes on to point out that Ozawa discloses amounts of phenolic resin, elastomer, and crosslinking agent and that the ratio of the mass of one or more novolac phenolic resin over the mass of one or more elastomers can be 0.75.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reason. Applicant has amended claim 14 to incorporate the elastomers of original claim 16. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has misread the Ozawa reference. The adhesive compositions of Ozawa are based on chlorinated polyolefins having chlorine contents greater than about 60 percent and molecular weights greater than 500 (see abstract of Ozawa). The purpose of the adhesive compositions of Ozawa is found in col. 1, lines 15-17, and is “for bonding elastomeric materials to metal surfaces.” In col. 1, lines 24-30 Ozawa teaches that the “chlorinated natural and

synthetic rubbers have been found to provide excellent film-forming properties, adhesional affinity for both metal surfaces and vulcanizing elastomers,...” Amended claim 14 does not recite chlorinated elastomers. Therefore, Ozawa does not anticipate Applicant’s amended claim 14. The Examiner has pointed to column 5, lines 54-65 and column 7, lines 25-55 for support of natural rubber, synthetic rubber, or acrylonitriles-butadiene copolymer as noted above. Column 5, lines 54-65 recite chlorinated and brominated elastomers. Applicant’s amended claim 14 does not recite such elastomers. Column 7, lines 25-33 has been misread by the Examiner. “The material” (col. 7, line 25, of Ozawa) refers to the elastomeric material that is to be bonded to a metal surface (see col. 7, lines 44-46) and not the adhesive composition which, Applicant has already pointed out, is limited to chlorinated and/or brominated elastomers. Since Applicant’s amended claim 14 is not anticipated by Ozawa the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 17-19, and 21-25 depend upon claim 14 and add further limitations thereto. Since amended claim 14 is patentable, likewise so are claims 15, 17-19, and 21-25. Claim 16 has been canceled.

The rejection of claims 14-15, 17-19, and 21-25 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ozawa et al. (U.S. 5,385,979) has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejections

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. (U.S. 5,385,979) in view of Fleming et al. (U.S. 2,839,443). Claim 20 depends upon amended claim 14 and adds further limitations thereto. As pointed out above, claim 14 is not taught or suggested by Ozawa. The addition of the vulcanizing agents of Fleming to Ozawa would not give all of the limitations of Applicant’s amended claim 14. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 20 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. (U.S. 5,385,979) in view of Fleming et al. (U.S. 2,839,443) has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. (U.S. 5,385,979) in view of Kropp et al. (U.S. 6,50,891). Claim 26 ultimately depends upon amended claim 14 and adds further limitations thereto. For the reasons discussed above, Ozawa does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicant's claim 26. Kropp does not add the missing elements required by claim 26. Therefore the Examiner's rejection of claim 26 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 26 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. (U.S. 5,385,979) in view of Kropp et al. (U.S. 6,500,891) has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Examination and reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

Applicant requests a telephone interview to more fully understand the examiners position and advance this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

25-August-2008
Date

By: /Stephen F. Wolf/
Stephen F. Wolf, Reg. No.: 45,502
Telephone No.: 651-736-9485

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833